

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD - MINUTES
CITY CONFERENCE ROOM 107
June 14, 2007: 4:00 P.M.

A quorum of the DRB was present. In the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, a majority of Design Review Board members voted to appoint Mr. Millikin as Acting Chair to conduct the meeting.

1A. Roll Call.

Members present: Lynch, Millikin, Nelson & Renz

Members absent: Bostater, Hamman & Perney

Department staff: Burger, Klima

1B. Introduction of Guests.

Michael Guttierrez

1C. Additions or corrections to the agenda.

None.

1D. Minutes of May 24, 2007.

Motion to accept minutes as presented approved (4-0).

2. Old Business:

None.

3. New Business:

- 3A. Application #CC07-5, filed by the Salina Surgical Hospital, 401 S. Santa Fe, requesting the approval of a certificate of compatibility to install two (2) new illuminated signs onto the top of the existing brick markers at the north and west entrances to the Salina Surgical Hospital site located at 401 S. Santa Fe. The subject property is legally described as Lots 1, 3 and the North 17.55 ft. of Lot 5 on Santa Fe and Lots 2, 4 and the North 17.55 ft. of Lot 6 on Fifth Street, all in Holland's Addition to the City of Salina.**

Mr. Burger presented the staff report for the proposed project as it is contained in the case file.

Mr. Nelson stated that he had a potential conflict of interest because he is employed by the Hospital and that he will abstain from voting on this item.

Mr. Millikin asked Mr. Guttierrez do you have anything you would like to add to John's report.

Mr. Guttierrez stated one clarification I would like to add. The whole sign will be replacing the concrete cap that is there on the brick markers, so the sign is replacing the concrete cap rather than being built on top of it. The concrete cap will be removed and the sign base will become the cap, the whole sign.

Mr. Millikin asked are the signs to be internally illuminated, and if so is there any electricity going out to the piers now?

Mr. Guttierrez stated the hospital will be bringing out the wiring for the signs. It is my understanding that they will be tunneling beneath the existing parking lot to bring the power out. The signs will be using fluorescent lighting on the interior of the cabinet. There won't be any ground lighting fixtures.

Ms. Lynch stated this would appear to harmonize well with the surgical center using the brick and the same graphics and will do what they require.

Mr. Millikin stated any further comments? I would entertain a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Renz stated I would move that we accept the application for the proposed signage as it is presented.

SECOND: Ms. Lynch seconded the motion.

VOTE: Motion approved 3-0, 1 Abstention (Nelson).

4. Other Matters.

Mr. Millikin stated that concludes our regular business. John do you have anything else to report?

Mr. Burger stated as you may remember, at the previous meeting Ms. Klima had requested information from staff regarding the proposed Ordinance amendment that you reviewed a few years ago and the Design Review Matrix for administrative review of Minor Projects that was part of it that the proposed amendments. The Ordinance amendments did not pass review by the City Commission. At the present our Ordinance allows staff to review projects that are up to \$1,000 in total cost. That includes material and labor. Some of the projects that are submitted to the Planning Department fall within this category and if there are no substantial changes or structural alterations we review those internally. This allows the building or sign permit for these smaller projects to be issued within a few days. Nick Slechta, who was one of our past SDI Directors, had initially contacted Jason Gage, who was the Assistant City Manager at the time to see if the existing BID Ordinance would allow for this staff review. The property owners and business owners didn't want to wait 2-3 weeks for meetings

of the DRB. The objective was to get minor projects, such as small signs, door or window replacements or improvements on non-principal facades issued sooner. Some members of the BID initially requested this. One type of project was the removal of old aluminum canopies or facades, which might be necessary to determine the underlying structure. This is sometimes necessary to design a replacement awning system. The removal of the old awning might not reach that \$1,000 threshold. The new awning would return to this Board for review because it is the finish treatment. We came up against this when Martha and David wanted to expand a bay to the south. They requested the removal of the existing wood canopy to determine what was behind the storefront transom area. In that case the replacement transom was later reviewed and approved by the DRB. Our newer members may not be familiar with the Ordinance amendment proposal or the Design Review Matrix that was proposed. The Matrix contained a listing of project types that administrative staff could review and issue to obtain building or sign permits. Having a Matrix or list of eligible projects allows the business owners to know ahead of time if their type of project would require scheduling a public meeting of the Board. Ms. Perney asked at our last meeting if we could include a copy of the proposed matrix in your packet so that you would be familiar with this proposal. The Ordinance amendments for Minor and Major Project review were tied in with the Matrix. When the Ordinance amendments did not pass the City Commission these were also not approved. The proposed change was referred back to the DRB and a public meeting was held by SDI to receive comments on the proposal. The Ordinance and comments at the SDI Forum in July 2004 was referred to the City Attorney because it contained some potential legal ramifications regarding potentially returning administration of the DRB back to SDI. Since we don't have all the members here today I believe that it would be better if we discuss this at the next meeting.

Ms. Klima stated that she hadn't reviewed the Matrix material yet but will before the next meeting.

5. The next meeting, if scheduled, will be on June 28, 2007.

Mr. Burger stated that we may have one application for the June 28 meeting if it is filed today. We will also like to follow up with a staff report on the status of the Design Review Matrix.

6. A motion to adjourn is in order.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

John Burger, Assistant Secretary

Attest:
